Programs Branch

User Report

FEAR OF CRIME, VICTIMIZATION AND ATTITUDES TO PROTECTIVE MEASURES

NO. 1984-61

87-04404/

Canadian Facts
Ottawa, Ontario

FEAR OF CRIME, VICTIMIZATION AND ATTITUDES TO PROTECTIVE MEASURES

NO. 1984-61

This working paper was prepared under contract for the Research Division and is made available as submitted to the Ministry. The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

This working paper is available in French. Ce document de travail est disponible en français.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

In 1982 the Research Division of the Ministry of the Solicitor General commissioned a study to analyze available data on the relationship between fear of crime, victimization, and attitudes to different protective measures, with a specific focus on attitudes toward the use of firearms for protection. The relevant literature included information from studies dealing with victimization, data from Gallup and CROP ominibus surveys.

The Ministry of the Solicitor General commissioned a Gallup survey in March of 1982. This survey includes questions on fear, victimization, and attitudes to protective measures. The specifications for this study included a full analysis of the data from this Gallup survey.

The questions to be addressed through the study were as follows:

- To what extent, if any, is 'fear of crime' increasing in Canada?

- Do Canadians think that the rate of crime in their neighbourhoods is increasing?

- Are persons who have been victimized more likely to have a higher level of fear of crime than those who have not?

- To what extent, if any, does the experience of being a victim affect attitudes to protective measures?

METHODOLOGY

This study involved a review of relevant literature provided by the Ministry, with a specific attempt to compare data obtained before and after the gun control legislation, which came into effect on January 1, 1978 and 1979. Studies dealing with Canadians' fear of crime were ordered chronologically.

The literature covered the following topics:

- Public information campaigns to increase awareness of the gun control legislation, various crime prevention programs and the 1978 Firearms Amnesty/Recall program;

- Estimates of the number of gun owners and users in Canada, reasons for ownership and types of weapon owned, as well as the estimated total gun stock in Canada;

- Surveys of public attitudes on such diversified topics as pardons, novel sentencing/retribution schemes, satisfaction with police in preventing and dealing with crime and the quality of life in Canada relative to other countries;

- Statistics on firearms-related accidents and suicides, provincial hunter/safety training programs, and sizes and types of Canadian businesses related to firearms;

- Statistics on the numbers of applications for Firearm Acquisition Certificates, rejected applications, registrations and permits for restricted weapons, number and type of Criminal Code offences pertaining to the new legislation;

- Public opinion polls and surveys attempting to measure fear of crime, incidence and types of victimization experience, and public views on the use of various protective measures.

Some of the literature provided a valuable historical perspective on the subject of gun control but only tangential information on the central issue of this study. The bibliography includes several sources which we consulted, but which are not discussed in depth. We have limited our comments to those studies which have direct bearing on the principal questions.

The different methodologies used in these studies limit the extent of comparative analysis. In some instances the samples are national, in others provincial or drawn from selected urban centre(s). The size of samples varied considerably from one study to another. A brief summary of the research methodology and specific limitations of the principal data sources follows.

1. Gallup National Ominibus Studies (1970-1982)

Sample Design

The Gallup Ominibus maintains a modified probability sample in all centres over 1,000 in population. A quota sample is used in rural farm and rural non-farm centres. An independent sample of individuals is selected for each survey.

The sampling procedure is designed to produce an approximation of the Canadian Civilian population, 18 years and older living in Canada except for those persons in institutions such as persons or hospitals, or those residing in Labrador, the Yukon or the Northwest Territories.

The principal sources used include:

- Gallup and CROP polls dealing with public perception of the amount and type of crime in Canadian communities;

- Selected poll and survey data describing the type and frequency of victimization experience among Canadians;

- Selected surveys which included questions on the kind and amount of protective measures taken against crime by Canadians and their attitudes to the use of such measures;

- Cross-tabulations from a 1982 Gallup survey of victims' and non-victims' perceptions of level of crime, their use of protective measures, and the demographic characteristics of the two groups;

- Cross-tabulations from the 1982 Gallup survey which compare the victimization experience, fear of crime and use of protective measures among people who have acquired guns for protection and those who have not.

Sampling Tolerances

Each Gallup report includes a table showing the "Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error of a Percentage." (At 95 in 100 Confidence Level.) These range from 2-3% (for sample size of 2,000) to 5-9% for sample size of 200.

March 1982 Survey

The March 1982 Gallup poll conducted for the Ministry of the Solicitor General asked a representative sample of 2,099 Canadians, 18 years of age and over about their perceptions of neighbourhood crime, victimization experience and attitudes to various protective measures. The sample tolerances on responses to questions asked of the total sample are reported as ±3%. Responses to questions asked of fewer than 2,099 people have correspondingly larger sample tolerances.

The sample design incorporates stratification by six community size groups, based on the most recent Census data: cities of 500,000 individuals and over, 100,000 to 500,000, 30,000 to 100,000, 10,000 to 30,000, 1,000 to 10,000, and rural farm and non-farm areas.

A sample of about 200 Enumeration Areas is selected. In urban centres, a random block sampling procedure is used to select starting points. In the households selected, the youngest male 18 years and over at home at the time of the interview is the respondent selected. If there is no male or the male quota is filled, the youngest female is selected. Response rates are not reported.

Weighting

The sample of completed interviews is adjusted (to the most recent Census data) for age group within sex. The age groups are 18-29, 30 to 49 and 50 years and over.

Methodology

In-home personel interviews are conducted with approximately 2,000 individuals, 18 years of age and over. Interviews are conducted over two three-day periods each month.

Sample Design

Samples of telephone listings were selected in each of seven Alberta cities or towns with populations of 10,000 or more. In two locations, stratified random samples (or telephone numbers) were selected. In the remainder listings were selected by RDD (Random Digit Dialing). The sample size for each location was proportionate to population.

Quota sampling was used within the households contacted so that at least one third of the sample would be male. Response rates were not reported. Independent samples of individuals 18 years of age and over were selected for two interviewing periods, February/March, 1978 and January/February 1979.

Methodology

Each of the two phases of the study involved telephone interviews. 1,031 were completed in phase one and 1,288 in phase two. The length of interview ranged from 20 to 35 minutes.

2. Crime Prevention Through Mass Media: An Evaluation

Silverman and Sacco, 1979

Objectives

The study was conducted in order to evaluate the effects of a mass media crime prevention campaign sponsored by the Solicitor General of Alberta. The survey was designed to compare levels of crime prevention knowledge and behaviour before and after commencement of the mass media crime prevention program and to assess levels of exposure to the crime prevention campaign and the relationship of that exposure to the likelihood of taking preventive measures.

3. Victimization In Greater Vancouver, Research Division, Ministry of the Solicitor General

Objectives

The Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey (GVVS) obtained information from the general population of individuals over 16 years of age about their victimization experience and about their attitudes and perceptions regarding crime and the criminal justice system. The survey addressed five major themes: The extent and distribution of selected personal and household crimes; the risk of criminal victimization; the impact of selected crimes in terms of financial cost and physical injury; public perception of criminal justice system functioning, and victims' needs.

The study was designed as a pilot for the National Urban Victimization Study.

Sample Design

A stratified simple random sample of households with telephones was selected in twelve municipalities in Greater Vancouver. Listings of all household residents 16 years of age and over were obtained in co-operating households and one individual in each household was selected at random as the designated respondent. Response rates were not reported.

Methodology

Telephone interviews were conducted by Statistics Canada interviewers. The results are based on 10,248 completed interviews. Information about criminal victimization experiences was obtained for the period January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1978.

GENERAL SUMMARY

1. To What Extent, If Any, Is Fear of Crime Increasing In Canada

The term "fear of crime" subsumes a number of definitions. Researchers have attempted to quantify the level of public concern about crime as a social problem. The three measures most frequently used for this purpose include the importance of crime relative to other social issues, perceptions of the incidence of crime at specific points in time, and opinions as to changes in the rate of crime (usually in specific communities) over time. In any discussion of 'fear of crime', these more objective concepts must be distinguished from those which focus on individuals' subjective fears or anxieties about the safety of their persons or property.

2. The Relative Importance Of Crime

Recently, several studies have included questions which attempted to measure the relative importance of crime within the context of other social issues. Silverman and Sacco asked respondents in both the pre-and-post campaign surveys to specify, from a predetermined list, those problems to which they 'had been paying most attention lately'. Crime was cited first by only 12% of respondents

and was not mentioned at all by over two-thirds (68%). However, it should be noted that the 'problems' which received more attention included 'inflation', 'unemployment' and 'family matters'. In the following year, C.M.H.C. conducted a study of urban issues in 23 urban centres across Canada. Respondents were asked to rank 26 urban problems (21 local and 5 general issues). Overall, 'reducing crime' was ranked third out of the range of issues presented. In 1981 the pilot study for Attitudes of the Canadian Public to Crime Policies asked respondents to identify, on an open-ended basis, problems which were of most concern to them in their daily lives. Crime was mentioned voluntarily by only 5% of the sample and ranked in sixth place out of the eight problem areas cited. In the same survey, crime was included in the three more frequently mentioned responses to a question on 'the three most important social problems in Canadian society'. Consistent with the other surveys noted above, crime ranked below items dealing with the economy.

3. Perceived Incidence of Crime/Changes in the Rate of Crime

Canadians have been asked about changes in the rate of crime in their 'community', 'neighbourhood' or 'area'. While differences in the wording of specific questions and survey methodologies necessarily restrict comparisons in general respondents in urban communities are apparently more likely to perceive the rate of crime as increasing over time. For example, in a Gallup poll conducted in 1972, 63% of respondents across Canada agreed that there was more crime in their specific communities than there had been five years previously. Similarly in the Solgen pilot study on attitudes to crime policies conducted in 1979, 76% of respondents placed the rate of crime in their districts above that of five years ago. The GVVS also found that 72% of the residents thought the rate of crime in Vancouver had increased over the last year or two. Consistent with the distinction noted above between objective perceptions of crime and personal concerns, these findings should not be interpreted as being an indicator of an increase in public concern or anxiety about personal safety.

4. Perceived Likelihood of Victimization/Specific Types of Crime

Perhaps a more potentially useful approach to assessing the extent and nature of 'fear of crime' is the type of question which asks respondents to evaluate their chances of becoming a victim of 'serious' crime, again within the specific context of their neighbourhood or city. Another variant of this type of measure asks people about the potential for becoming victims of specific types of crime--for example break and entry, vandalism, assault, car theft, etc.

Both the GVVS and the March 1982 Gallup survey, among others, indicate that the majority of people regard property loss or vandalism as 'the most serious crime problem' in their own neighbourhoods. In the GVVS, 66% cited this category of crime, a proportion similar to the 59% reported in the Gallup study. On the other hand, only 15% of respondents to the GVVS felt that there was a serious crime problem in their neighbourhood. Similarly, 11% of the March 1982 Gallup sample felt that their neighbourhood was characterized by a high amount of crime.

Again it is important to note that public perceptions of the incidence of crime or increases in the crime rate do not necessarily imply corresponding increases in personal fears or anxieties. The results of the Silverman and Sacco study,

for example, showed that the majority of people thought their chances of becoming a victim of a specific crime had gone up in recent years. However, when asked to rate their neighbourhood for safety relative to other areas of town, one third (36%) felt safer than in other areas of town and 57% said it was about average.

5. Differences By Sub-Group

The March 1982 Gallup Study suggests that certain sub-groups within the population perceive higher levels both of crime in general and specific types of crime. People in British Columbia, Quebec and younger people from age 18 to 29 were most likely to state that there is a serious crime problem in their neighbourhoods. Property loss and vandalism were cited relatively more often by people in British Columbia and Quebec, people with higher educations and incomes and people in labour or clerical occupations. Crimes involving personal safety were reported by relatively more Quebecers than average. Drug and alcohol related crimes were mentioned more often by those living in Atlantic Canada, Quebec and small communities, and those with low education and income. Disturbing the peace (noisy parties, etc.) was reported by relatively more Prairie dwellers and younger people.

6. Night Time Neighbourhood Safety

The concept most frequently used to explore 'fear of crime' is that of personal safety in the neighbourhood when walking alone at night. Generally, this has been intended as a measure of fear of violence in public places .

Chart 1 orders chronologically the Canadian studies which have included this type of item over the period 1970 to 1982. In contrast to most other indicators of 'fear of crime', the wording of the questions has been fairly consistent. Respondents either have been asked about their fear of walking at night in a specified area close to home or about the relative safety of walking alone in their own neighbourhood. Overall, the proportion of each sample reporting some degree of fear has ranged from 22% to 37%.

Again the 1982 Gallup study indicating that certain segments of the population feel less safe than others. Women, older people, those with low incomes, large city dwellers and Quebecers report more concern than average about taking a solitary evening walk in their area. However, there is no evidence from the national surveys conducted by CROP and Gallup of any consistent trend toward an increase over time among members of the public as a whole of fear with respect to safety at night.

CHART 1-A NIGHTTIME NEIGHBOURHOOD SAFETY FEAR OF CRIME

STUDY	SAMPLE	METHOD	SPECIFIC WORDING	RESULTS
1. Gallup December 1970	N=1,000 18 years and over. ±4% error at 95% confidence level.	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Is there any area around here, that is to say, within a mile, where you would be afraid to walk at night?	29% YES
2. Gallup November 1974	N=1,070 18 years and over. ±4% error at 95% confidence level.	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Same as No. 1.	37% YES
3. CROP November 1976	N=1,000 18 years and over. ±3% error at 95% confidence level	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Are you afraid to walk at night in your neighbourhood?	22% YES
4. Silverman & Sacco February - March 1978	N=1,031 18 years and over. 7 urban areas in Alberta.	Phone interviews. Random digit dialing in five areas, stratified random sampling in two.	How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighbourhood at night? Would you say that you feel a) very safe b) reasonably safe c) somewhat unsafe d) very unsafe?	a. 29% c. 18% b. 40% d. 12% > 30%
5. Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey January - February 1979	N=10,248 16 years and over. Vancouver area.	Phone interviews. Stratified random sample of household telephone numbers.	How safe do you feel or would you feel walking alone in your neighbourhood after dark? a) very safe b) reasonably safe c) somewhat unsafe d) very unsafe	a. 37% c. 19% b. 29% d. 13% > 32%
6. CROP May 1979	N=1,893 18 years and over. ±3% error at 95% confidence level.	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Same as No. 3.	24% YES
7. Gallup November 1979	N=1,055 18 years and over. ±4% error at 95% confidence level.	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Same as No. 1.	31% YES
8. CROP April 1981	N=1,927 18 years and over. ±3% error at 95% confidence level.	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Same as No. 3.	26% YES
9. Gallup November 1981	N=1,020 18 years and over. ±4% error at 95% confidence level.	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Same as No. 1.	34% YES
10. Gallup March 1982	N=2,099 18 years and over. ±3% error at 95% confidence level.	Personal interviews. Stratified national sample.	Same as No. 5.	a. 45% c. 15% b. 30% d. 9% > 24%

7. Attitudes To and Use of Protective Measures

A positive trend toward the acceptance and adoption of protective measures also could be interpreted as yet another indicator of an increase in fear of crime. Data on this subject is available only for the period 1978 to 1982.

In 1978 Silverman and Sacco asked respondents about their use of protective measures in 'the past six months' and also measured the reported incidence of any use of specific measures. Locking doors and windows and notifying neighbours of absence from home were those most frequently mentioned as having ever been used. Nearly half (45%) of the sample reported taking some specific action with the six month period.

The GVVS asked a similar question about the use of protective measures in the 'last year or two'. Forty percent reported some activity other than locking doors. Again the Alberta study respondents appear to be most concerned about protecting their property. The most popular types of measures are informing neighbours when going away, leaving lights on and installation of better locks and bars on windows.

The March 1982 Gallup Study included several questions on attitudes toward various protective measures. The majority of respondents said people should install burglar alarms (63%), keep lights on in their homes (83%) and make arrangements with their neighbours to take care of their homes (94%) when they are away. Support for people keeping firearms in their homes to protect themselves was given by over one-fifth (21%) of the sample. Men, Atlantic, Prairie and small town and rural dwellers, and those with low education and minority ethnic backgrounds, (i.e. rather English or non-French mother tongue), were more likely than average to report that people should possess firearms for protection against crime. However, as discussed subsequently, attitudinal support is more common than actual use of these measures.

Respondents were questioned about present or past use of these four protective measures by themselves or their families. Leaving the lights on (79%) and informing the neighbours when away (85%), were actually used, as well as verbally supported, by the majority of people. In contrast, while 63% of the sample claim to support the installation of burglar alarms, only 7% of the sample actually use them.

People who reported that they or their families have, at some point in the past, acquired firearms as a protective measure, amount to 10% of the sample, compared to the 21% who support the idea. Acquisition of firearms for protection was reported more frequently by men, small town or rural dwellers, Quebecers, people from 30 to 49 years of age and those with average incomes of $10 to $20,000 a year.

Those people who did not report use of the specific measures were asked if they would consider using them in the future. The majority of people already reported leaving their lights on and informing their neighbours when away. One-third of the current or past non-users of burglar alarms reported that they would consider installing them in the future. Of those people (90% of the overall sample) who had not previously acquired a firearm for protective purposes, 8% said they would consider acquiring such a weapon in the future. This group of potential firearms acquisitors were more frequently from the Atlantic or Prairie provinces, of low education and minority ethnic background and small town or rural dwellers. Given the undefined

nature of the necessary pre-conditions surrounding future use in the minds of the respondents, and surmising that some people would "consider" but would then reject using firearms for protective purposes, this 7% may be somewhat of an overestimate of likely future firearms acquisitors.

In sum, the data show that the majority of people support and use the protective measures of leaving the lights on and informing neighbours when they are away. While most people in this sample believed in the concept of installing burglar alarms, a very small proportion (7%) of them have actually done so, although almost one-third say they would consider it in the future. Attitudinal support for acquisition of firearms as a protective measure was given by one-fifth of the sample, although only 1 in 10 people reported actual use of this measure. A further small percentage of people (7% overall) said they would consider acquiring a firearm in the future.

8. Victims Versus Non-Victims

The experience of victimization may affect both individuals' perceptions of the amount of crime in their neighbourhood, and their attitudes to various protective measures. Data on this issue comes from the GVVS and the March 1982 Gallup survey.

The GVVS results indicate that being the victim of a recent crime will tend to increase perceptions of the amount and seriousness of neighbourhood crime. Perceptions of high levels of neighbourhood crime were most likely among those who had been victimized two or more times. In addition, this study found that non-victims who lived in areas with proportionately high victimization rates, also perceived more of a crime problem in their neighbourhood than did non-victims who lived in areas with low victimization rates.

The report also states that non-victims living in high victimization rate areas felt less safe taking a walk alone in their neighbourhood at night, than did non-victims in low victimization rate areas.

Cross-tabulations on victimization and use of protective measures were not reported, except indirectly. Those people who perceived their neighbourhood as having a serious crime problem, which logically includes but is not necessarily restricted to victims, were more likely to always lock their homes during the day when someone was there, than were people who perceived their neighbourhoods as having a low amount of crime. The authors report that additional protective measures taken by 40% of the people in this sample were not well correlated with crime perceptions or victimization experience.

Information on victims' crime perceptions and use of protective measures was also obtained from the March 1982 Gallup poll data. As discussed below the findings were generally consistent with those from the GVVS.

When questioned about victimization experience, 13% of the people in the March 1982 Gallup sample reported that they had been the victim of a serious crime at some point in the past. Incidence of victimization was highest among people aged 30-49, living in large cities, of high education and income. The majority of victims (68%) reported being the targets of crimes involving property

loss or damage without personal attack or threat. Crimes involving personal attack or threat accounted for a further 30%, divided between those with (14%) and without (16%) accompanying property loss. Of the people who had ever been victimized (13% overall), one-third had been victimized during the preceding year. Thus 4% of the total sample reported being the victims of a serious crime from March 1981 to March 1982. Crimes involving property loss or damage without personal attack or threat were again predominant (74% of recent victimizations).

Table 1 shows distribution of responses to specific questions for victims, non-victims and the sample as a whole.

People who reported ever being the victim of a serious crime perceived higher levels of crime in their neighbourhood than non-victims. They felt only slightly less safe taking a solitary walk around their neighbourhoods after dark than persons who had not been victimized. Victims were more apt to be concerned, about crimes involving property loss than were non-victims. Similarly victims were more likely to install burglar alarms and leave lights on in their homes when away. The levels of firearms acquisition were similar for both victims and non-victims.

TABLE I

	Victims (N=267)	Non-Victims (N=1,828)	Total (N=2,099)
1. LEVEL OF CRIME			
High	19	10	11
Average	37	24	26
Low	41	64	61
2. SAFETY WALKING			
Day - Safe	93	97	97
- Unsafe	6	3	3
Night - Safe	65	76	74
- Unsafe	34	23	24
3. MOST SERIOUS CRIME PROBLEM			
Property Loss	51	37	38
No Serious Problem	6	16	15
4. USE OF PROTECTIVE MEASURES			
Burglar Alarms	13	7	7
Lights	86	78	79
Firearms	12	10	10
Neighbours	88	85	85

Note: All figures given are percentages.

9. Acquisition of Firearms As A Protective Measure

Relatively little information is available on the acquisition of firearms as a protective measure. In the Sacco and Silverman study 6% of gun owners voluntarily stated that they kept guns in their homes for protection. In the GVVS only 1% of the sample mentioned carrying or purchasing a weapon for protection. Similarly, the 1981 Solgen pilot study results show that only 4% of respondents report that they have 'ever' carried 'a protective weapon'. The March 1982 Gallup study provided an opportunity for a small scale exploration of the possible relationships between the acquisition of weapons and specific indicators of fear of crime.

Table 2 shows the response percentages for "gun acquisitors" on selected questions, compared to non-gun acquisitors and the sample as a whole. These 209 people, or 10% of the overall sample, are those who reported that they or their families have acquired firearms for protective purposes. The wording of the question was such that this group may include people who, at one time, acquired a firearm for protection, but who no longer maintain such a weapon. In addition, this 10% may exclude those people who own firearms, but who did not acquire them for protective purposes. We have no way of knowing if those people who acquired firearms for other reasons, such as hunting, may or may not also "use" them as protective measures.

Given these caveats, we find that gun-acquisitors perceive only a marginally higher incidence of crime in their neighbourhoods than those who have not acquired firearms. In common with the rest of the sample, they believe crimes involving property loss to be the greatest single crime problem in their neighbourhoods. Their level of concern about crimes involving drugs and alcohol does not differ from that expressed by the remainder of the sample. Substantially more gun acquisitors than average report installing burglar alarms and leaving their lights on when they are away.

Several unexpected findings and inconsistencies were also seen in the responses of this sub-group. Fifteen percent of these people who reported acquiring a firearm for protective purposes, believe that there is no serious crime problem in their neighbourhood, and 20% of them do not think people "should" keep firearms in their homes to protect themselves. As well, more gun acquisitors reported feeling more safe when walking alone in their neighbourhoods at night, than do non-gun acquisitors.

Regarding the relationship of gun acquisitors to victimization, several interesting findings emerged. Only a marginally higher percentage of gun acquisitors reported having been the victim of a serious crime at some point in the past (16% versus 12% of non-gun acquisitors). Those reporting gun acquisitions were more likely to have been the victims of crimes involving personal attack or threat, with and without accompanying property loss, than were non-gun acquisitors. Correspondingly, crimes involving only property loss, by far the largest category for the sample as a whole, accounted for less than 50% of those crimes experienced by gun acquisitors.

A similar trend is seen in the answers of those respondents who believe that people "should" keep firearms in their homes. This sub-group, comprising 21% of the overall sample, includes both gun acquisitors and non-gun acquisitors. They also report a slightly higher (15%) than average incidence of victimization at some point in the past, with increased crimes involving personal attack or threat, both with (15%) and without (22%) accompanying property loss, and fewer involving only property loss (57%).

Finally, excluding the present "gun acquisitors", those people (7% overall) who are potential future gun acquisitors, also reported a higher (21%) than average incidence of victimization. This sub-group had been the victims of increased crimes involving personal attack or threat without property loss (21%) and crimes involving only property loss (73%).

Thus at least for this sample of Canadians, there may be a relationship between victimization experience, particularly of those crimes involving personal attack or threat, and use of firearms as a protective measure. The possibility of such a trend is further suggested by the similar findings for people who have not acquired firearms, but whose attitudes indicate a positive bias toward this protective measure, and for people who would consider employing this measure in the future.

TABLE 2

	Gun Acquisitors (N=209)	Non-Gun Acquisitors (N=1,875)	Total (N=2,099)
1. LEVEL OF CRIME			
High	14	10	11
Average	23	26	26
Low	60	62	61
2. MOST SERIOUS CRIME PROBLEM			
Property Loss	38	38	38
Drugs, Alcohol	13	9	9
No Serious Problem	15	15	15
3. USE OF PROTECTIVE MEASURES			
Burglar Alarms	19	6	7
Lights	87	78	79
4. SAFETY WALKING			
Night - Safe	81	74	74
- Unsafe	19	25	24
5. SERIOUS CRIME VICTIM	16	12	13
Property Loss Only	47	71	68
Personal Attack&Property Loss	22	14	14
Personal Attack Only	19	15	16

Note: All figures given are percentages.

CONCLUSIONS

This review of available data on 'fear of crime' does not lend any support to the hypothesis that Canadians are becoming more fearful about their personal safety or property. There is a general tendency, particularly among urban residents, for people to think that the overall crime rate is increasing and that the incidence of specific crimes has gone up over time. Certain subgroups for example, the 'elderly' do appear to consistently report a higher level of subjective concern about crime and to be somewhat more 'fearful' than others. Overall, however, there have been no apparent changes over the past decade in the level of individuals' concerns about their personal safety within their own neighbourhoods.

The most generally accepted and used protective measures are those directed at the protection of personal property--for example, locking doors, notifying neighbours when away and improving locks. Only a very small proportion of individuals (10% or less) depending on the specific study, state that they have acquired or carry guns for purposes of protection.

Persons who have been victimized are more apt to perceive a higher rate of crime in their neighbourhoods than those who have not. They are somewhat more concerned about crimes involving property loss than 'non-victims'. Similarly victims appear to be more apt to adopt specific measures such as burglar alarms and leaving lights on than persons who have no experience of victimization. There is some evidence to suggest that persons who acquire guns for protection are more likely to have been victims of crimes involving personal attack or threat.

There are limitations on the data available in these subject areas. More definitive information on the short and long-term effects of victimization will be obtained through the National Victimization study and studies which attempt to identify and tract any changes in the behaviour and attitudes of victims over over time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bertrand, F. Public Opinions About Criminal Justice Issues: Some Cautions About Poll Data, unpublished, 1981.

2. Bill C-51 An Act to Amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penetentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act, 1977 (passed).

3. Bill C-451 An Act to Amend the Criminal Code (Gun Control), 1980 (first reading).

4. Burbidge, S. Public Attitudes Concerning Pardons, unpublished, 1982.

5. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Public Priorities In Urban Canada: A Survey of Community Concerns, 1979.

6. Canadian Facts National Survey of Awarness of the Gun Control Legislation, unpublished, 1978.

7. Canadian Facts Pre-Test of Public Information Programs Dealing with Amnesty/Recall and the Firearms Aquisition Certificate, unpublished, 1979.

8. Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. Annual Firearms Report to the Solicitor General of Canada, 1978.

9. Ibid., 1979.

10. Ibid., 1980.

11. Ibid., 1981.

12. Gallup National Omnibus Poll, March 1982.

13. Glackman, W., Corrado, R.R. and Roesch, R. The Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey: Public Attitudes About Crime and Safety, unpublished, 1981.

14. Moore, R.J. Perception of the Law and the Legal System: A Preliminary Report of the Findings, unpublished, 1981.

15. Scarff, E., Zaharchuk, T., Jacques, T. and McAuley, M. Evaluation of the Canadian Gun Control Legislation. First Progress Report, Ottawa: Communications Division, Solicitor General of Canada, 1981.

16. Scarff, E., Zaharchuk, T., Jacques, T. and McAuley, M. Evaluation of the Canadian Gun Control Legislation. Second Progress Report, unpublished, 1982.

17. Silverman, R.A. and Sacco, V.F. Crime Prevention Through Mass Media: An Evaluation. Final Report., unpublished, 1980.

18. Solicitor General's Dept. The Attitudes of Canadian Public to Crime Policies - Pilot Study, unpublished, 1981.

19. Stenning, P. (Ed.) Firearms and Their Control in Canada - Working Papers, unpublished, 1978.

20. Stenning, P. and Moyer, S. Firearms Ownership and Use in Canada: A Report of Survey Findings, 1976, unpublished, 1979.

21. Williams, J.S. and McGrath, J.H. Why People Own Guns, Jnl. of Communication, 1976, 26:4, 22-30.

22. Selected Poll Results:

    i. CROP - November 1976, May 1979, April 1981, September 1981.

    ii. Decima Quarterly Report - December 1981.

    iii. Gallup - December 1970, August 1972, November 1974, February 1977, September 1979, November 1979, January 1981, November 1981, February 1982.

23. Selected Newspaper Articles:

    i. Frontier Justice, The Edmonton Journal, February 1982.

    ii. Gun Clubs Used to Get Weapons, The Calgary Herald, March 1982.

    iii. Gun Permit Ruse Worries Police, The Toronto Star, April 1982.

iv. Harry Walter Just Took A Shot in the Dark, The Vancouver Sun, March 1982.

v. Les Canadiens Français Seraient Trop Libéraux Face à La Prostitution, Dimanche-Matin, April 1982.

vi. More Control Sought On Gun Acquisitions, The Toronto Star, February 1982.

vii. Police Report Purchase of Handguns on the Rise, The Winnipeg Free Press, March 1982.

viii. Trio to Discuss Crime, Violence, Sunday Express, April 1982.

C8032 CANADIAN FACTS

PAGE	TABLE	TITLE	BASE
1		Q.1 PERCEIVED INCIDENCE OF CRIME IN NEIGHBOURHOOD	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
2		Q.2-A/B SAFETY OF WALKING ALONE THROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
4		Q.3 CRIME PROBLEM MOST SERIOUS IN NEIGHBOURHOOD	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
5		Q.4 INSTALLATION OF BURGLAR ALARMS IN HOME	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
6		Q.5 KEEPING LIGHTS ON WHEN AWAY FROM HOME	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
7		Q.6 RETENTION OF FIREARMS IN HOME FOR PROTECTION	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
8		Q.7 NEIGHBOUR ARRANGEMENTS TO CARE FOR HOME WHILE AWAY	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
9		Q.8A/B USE OF/CONSIDERED USE OF LISTED PROTECTIVE MEASURES	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
13		Q.9 INCIDENCE OF BEING A VICTIM OF SERIOUS CRIME	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
14		Q.10 INCIDENCE OF BEING A VICTIM OF CRIME IN PAST TWELVE MONTHS	TOTAL HAVE BEEN A VICTEM OF A SERIOUS CRIME
15		PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER
25		DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWS	TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

Q.1 PERCEIVED INCIDENCE OF CRIME IN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	[illegible] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[illegible] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	134	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
AMOUNT OF CRIME IS:									
HIGH	225	60	150	29	191	19	165	51	173
	10.7	13.5	9.7	13.8	10.2	12.4	9.9	19.2	9.5
AVERAGE	534	117	387	48	482	45	418	98	435
	25.5	26.5	25.0	23.1	25.7	29.2	25.1	36.7	23.8
LOW	1286	254	975	126	1154	89	1039	110	1173
	61.3	57.4	63.0	60.4	61.5	57.2	62.3	41.3	64.2
DON'T KNOW	54	11	36	6	48	2	44	8	46
	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.7	2.6	1.3	2.7	2.9	2.5
NOT STATED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q.2-A/B SAFETY OF WALKING ALONE THROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	~~WISH~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	~~WISH~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WALKING ALONE:									
DURING DAY--									
VERY SAFE	1648	339	1244	169	1470	119	1317	194	1452
	78.5	76.6	80.4	81.0	78.4	76.6	79.0	72.8	79.4
REASONABLY SAFE	377	83	257	27	344	32	300	54	321
	18.0	18.7	16.6	13.0	18.4	20.7	18.0	20.4	17.5
SOMEWHAT UNSAFE	47	15	28	8	38	3	30	11	36
	2.2	3.3	1.8	3.7	2.0	2.0	1.8	4.0	2.0
VERY UNSAFE	21	6	15	5	16	1	15	6	15
	1.0	1.4	1.0	2.3	.9	.7	.9	2.4	.8
DON'T KNOW	5	0	3	0	5	0	5	1	4
	.3	0	.2	0	.3	0	.3	.4	.2
NOT STATED	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q.2-A/B SAFETY OF WALKING ALONE THROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		~~USED~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
AFTER DARK--									
VERY SAFE	942	206	695	111	826	70	743	104	837
	44.9	46.6	44.9	52.9	44.0	44.8	44.6	38.9	45.8
REASONABLY SAFE	619	112	474	59	559	37	504	71	548
	29.5	25.3	30.6	28.2	29.8	23.9	30.2	26.5	30.0
SOMEWHAT UNSAFE	316	76	227	18	293	31	257	54	262
	15.1	17.1	14.7	8.7	15.6	19.8	15.4	20.1	14.3
VERY UNSAFE	196	43	135	21	173	15	143	37	139
	9.3	9.8	8.7	10.2	9.2	9.8	8.6	13.8	8.7
DON'T KNOW	25	4	18	0	25	3	21	2	23
	1.2	.9	1.1	0	1.3	1.7	1.2	.7	1.2
NOT STATED	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	.1	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q.3 CRIME PROBLEM MOST SERIOUS IN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	134	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
CRIME PROBLEM MOST SERIOUS									
PERSONAL SAFETY	125	32	81	14	109	12	90	19	106
	5.9	7.3	5.3	6.9	5.8	7.8	5.4	7.0	5.8
PROPERTY LOSS	805	151	613	79	718	55	646	135	668
	38.3	34.1	39.6	37.8	38.3	35.7	38.8	50.6	36.5
VANDALISM	423	89	318	38	382	34	336	46	375
	20.2	20.0	20.5	18.0	20.4	21.9	20.2	17.3	20.5
DISTURBING THE PEACE	148	27	116	13	135	10	121	15	133
	7.0	6.2	7.5	6.1	7.2	6.5	7.3	5.7	7.3
DRUGS, ALCOHOL	197	54	137	27	168	19	147	24	173
	9.4	12.2	8.8	13.0	9.0	12.4	8.8	9.0	9.5
PROSTITUTION	4	2	2	0	4	1	3	1	3
	.2	.5	.1	0	.2	.7	.2	.3	.2
OTHER	22	7	13	3	20	2	17	4	19
	1.1	1.6	.9	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.5	1.0
NO SERIOUS CRIME PROBLEM	309	62	223	30	278	16	236	16	294
	14.7	14.1	14.4	14.5	14.8	10.1	15.3	5.9	16.1
DON'T KNOW	64	18	44	5	59	6	50	8	56
	3.0	4.0	2.8	2.4	3.1	3.7	3.0	2.8	3.1
NOT STATED	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	2
	.1	0	.1	0	.1	0	.1	0	.1

Q.4 INSTALLATION OF BURGLAR ALARMS IN HOME
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BURGLAR ALARMS: --									
YES, SHOULD INSTALL	1315	328	915	158	1145	113	1001	178	1133
	62.6	74.2	59.1	75.4	61.1	72.9	60.0	66.6	62.0
NO, SHOULD NOT	654	97	534	44	608	38	558	76	577
	31.1	22.0	34.5	20.8	32.4	24.7	33.5	28.6	31.6
DON'T KNOW	127	14	98	8	118	2	106	12	115
	6.0	3.2	6.3	3.8	6.3	1.2	6.4	4.5	6.3
NOT STATED	4	3	1	0	4	2	2	1	3
	.2	.6	.1	0	.2	1.1	.1	.4	.2

Q.9 KEEPING LIGHTS ON WHEN AWAY FROM HOME
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WHEN AWAY FROM HOME:--									
YES, SHOULD KEEP LIGHTS ON	1749	366	1296	178	1559	129	1385	232	1513
	83.3	82.7	83.7	85.1	83.1	83.0	83.1	87.0	82.8
NO, SHOULD NOT	296	66	219	28	267	22	238	30	266
	14.1	15.0	14.2	13.4	14.3	14.2	14.3	11.3	14.6
DON'T KNOW	51	9	32	3	47	4	42	5	47
	2.4	2.1	2.1	1.4	2.5	2.8	2.5	1.7	2.6
NOT STATED	2	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2
	.1	.3	.1	0	.1	0	.1	0	.1

Q.6 RETENTION OF FIREARMS IN HOME FOR PROTECTION
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
FIREARMS IN HOME:--									
YES, SHOULD KEEP FOR PROTECTION	443	443	0	167	271	102	158	65	374
	21.1	100.0	0	79.7	14.4	65.3	9.5	24.5	20.5
NO, SHOULD NOT	1548	0	1548	35	1504	46	1431	183	1365
	73.8	0	100.0	16.9	80.2	29.9	85.8	68.4	74.7
DON'T KNOW	102	0	0	6	95	7	74	18	84
	4.9	0	0	3.0	5.1	4.8	4.4	6.7	4.6
NOT STATED	6	0	0	1	5	0	4	1	5
	.3	0	0	.5	.3	0	.3	.4	.3

Q.7 NEIGHBOUR ARRANGEMENTS TO CARE FOR HOME WHILE AWAY
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		NEED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
CARE OF HOME WHILE AWAY: --									
YES, SHOULD ASK NEIGHBOURS	1979	419	1465	194	1770	150	1569	249	1726
	94.3	94.8	94.6	92.8	94.4	96.6	94.1	93.2	94.4
NO, SHOULD NOT	94	19	69	10	84	5	78	15	79
	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.5	3.4	4.7	5.5	4.3
DON'T KNOW	23	3	12	4	19	0	18	2	21
	1.1	.7	.8	2.1	1.0	0	1.1	.9	1.1
NOT STATED	3	1	2	1	2	0	2	1	2
	.1	.2	.1	.5	.1	0	.1	.4	.1

Q.8A/B USE OF/CONSIDERED USE OF LISTED PROTECTIVE MEASURES
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
INSTALLED BURGLAR ALARMS									
YES	153	45	102	39	113	8	105	35	118
	7.3	10.1	6.6	18.6	6.0	4.9	6.3	12.9	6.5
NO	1934	395	1439	170	1760	148	1560	231	1701
	92.1	89.3	92.9	81.4	93.9	95.1	93.6	86.4	93.1
NOT STATED	12	3	8	0	2	0	2	2	8
	.6	.6	.5	0	.1	0	.1	.7	.4
TOTAL STATING NO	1934	395	1439	170	1760	148	1560	231	1701
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WOULD CONSIDER USING									
YES	638	160	444	64	573	95	464	81	554
	33.0	40.6	30.9	37.6	32.6	63.9	29.7	35.3	32.6
NO	1152	204	895	91	1058	47	1000	130	1022
	59.5	51.7	62.2	53.6	60.2	31.8	64.1	56.4	60.1
DON'T KNOW	135	23	96	14	121	5	94	19	115
	7.0	5.9	6.7	8.1	6.9	3.5	6.1	8.3	6.8
NOT STATED	10	7	3	1	7	1	2	0	10
	.5	1.8	.2	.7	.4	.8	.1	0	.6

Q.8A/B USE OF/CONSIDERED USE OF LISTED PROTECTIVE MEASURES
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
TURNED ON LIGHTS									
YES	1656	345	1235	182	1466	121	1305	230	1423
	78.9	77.9	79.8	87.2	78.2	77.7	78.3	86.1	77.8
NO	432	95	305	26	406	35	359	35	396
	20.6	21.5	19.7	12.3	21.7	22.3	21.5	13.3	21.7
NOT STATED	11	3	8	1	3	0	3	2	9
	.5	.6	.5	.4	.2	0	.2	.7	.5
TOTAL STATING NO	432	95	305	26	406	35	359	35	396
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WOULD CONSIDER USING									
YES	134	37	84	7	126	21	102	11	123
	31.0	39.4	27.4	28.2	31.2	60.9	28.4	31.1	31.0
NO	286	56	212	19	267	12	251	23	262
	66.2	58.5	69.5	71.8	65.8	35.9	69.8	65.7	66.2
DON'T KNOW	10	1	8	0	10	1	6	1	9
	2.4	1.2	2.7	0	2.5	3.2	1.6	3.1	2.3
NOT STATED	2	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	2
	.4	1.0	.3	0	.5	0	.3	0	.5

Q.8A/B USE OF/CONSIDERED USE OF LISTED PROTECTIVE MEASURES
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

ABSOLUTES/COL %

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ACQUIRED FIREARMS									
YES	209	167	35	209	0	0	0	33	176
	10.0	37.7	2.3	100.0	0	0	0	12.3	9.7
NO	1875	271	1504	0	1875	155	1667	230	1643
	89.3	61.2	97.1	0	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.0	89.9
NOT STATED	15	5	9	0	0	0	0	5	8
	.7	1.2	.6	0	0	0	0	1.8	.5
TOTAL STATING NO	1875	271	1504	0	1875	155	1667	230	1643
	100.0	100.0	100.0	0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WOULD CONSIDER USING									
YES	155	102	46	0	155	155	0	33	122
	8.3	37.5	3.1	0	8.3	100.0	0	14.2	7.4
NO	1667	158	1431	0	1667	0	1667	191	1475
	88.9	58.4	95.1	0	88.9	0	100.0	83.1	89.8
DON'T KNOW	44	7	23	0	44	0	0	5	39
	2.4	2.6	1.5	0	2.4	0	0	2.2	2.4
NOT STATED	8	4	4	0	8	0	0	1	7
	.4	1.5	.3	0	.4	0	0	.5	.4

Q.8A/B USE OF/CONSIDERED USE OF LISTED PROTECTIVE MEASURES
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	~~USED~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	~~USED~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
INFORMED NEIGHBOURS									
YES	1788	361	1345	180	1602	127	1432	234	1551
	85.2	81.6	86.9	85.9	85.4	81.7	85.9	87.7	84.8
NO	301	80	196	30	271	28	233	31	270
	14.3	18.0	12.6	14.1	14.5	18.3	14.0	11.6	14.8
NOT STATED	10	2	7	0	2	0	2	2	7
	.5	.4	.5	0	.1	0	.1	.7	.4
TOTAL STATING NO	301	80	196	30	271	28	233	31	270
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WOULD CONSIDER USING									
YES	148	39	96	16	132	24	104	16	132
	49.2	49.4	49.0	53.1	48.8	84.0	44.8	51.8	48.9
NO	139	38	90	14	126	3	121	15	124
	46.3	48.0	45.8	46.9	46.3	12.0	52.1	48.2	46.1
DON'T KNOW	11	1	9	0	11	1	7	0	11
	3.8	1.4	4.7	0	4.2	4.0	3.1	0	4.2
NOT STATED	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
	.7	1.2	.6	0	.8	0	0	0	.8

Q.9 INCIDENCE OF BEING A VICTIM OF SERIOUS CRIME
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	~~USED~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	~~USED~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------- YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------- NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
A SERIOUS CRIME: --									
HAVE BEEN A VICTIM	267	65	183	33	230	33	191	267	0
	12.7	14.8	11.8	15.6	12.2	21.0	11.4	100.0	0
NO, HAVE NOT	1828	374	1365	176	1643	122	1475	0	1828
	87.1	84.5	88.1	84.4	87.6	78.3	88.5	0	100.0
DON'T KNOW/NOT STATED	4	3	1	0	2	1	1	0	0
	.2	.7	.1	0	.1	.7	.1	0	0
TOTAL WHO HAVE BEEN A VICTIM	267	65	183	33	230	33	191	267	0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0
TYPE OF CRIME									
PERSONAL ATTACK OR THREAT WITHOUT PROPERTY LOSS	41	14	25	6	34	7	26	41	0
	15.5	22.1	13.9	18.9	14.9	20.8	13.8	15.5	0
PERSONAL ATTACK OR THREAT WITH PROPERTY LOSS	38	10	25	7	31	4	27	38	0
	14.3	14.6	13.4	22.4	13.5	12.8	14.0	14.3	0
PROPERTY LOSS OR DAMAGE WITHOUT ATTACK OR THREAT	182	38	131	15	163	24	134	182	0
	68.1	57.4	71.9	46.7	71.0	72.3	70.3	68.1	0
DON'T KNOW/NOT STATED	14	6	8	5	9	0	9	14	0
	5.2	9.2	4.3	15.4	3.8	0	4.6	5.2	0

Q.10 INCIDENCE OF BEING A VICTIM OF CRIME IN PAST TWELVE MONTHS
BASE TOTAL HAVE BEEN A VICTEM OF A SERIOUS CRIME

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------- YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------- NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	268	65	184	32	231	33	192	268	0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	267	65	183	33	230	33	191	267	0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0
IN PAST 12 MONTHS: --									
YES, WAS A VICTIM OF SERIOUS CRIME	85	24	55	10	73	8	64	85	0
	31.8	36.3	30.1	31.2	31.7	25.2	33.4	31.8	0
NO, WAS NOT	178	40	125	22	153	24	124	178	0
	66.6	60.6	68.7	65.9	66.8	74.8	64.8	66.6	0
DON'T KNOW/NOT STATED	4	2	2	1	3	0	3	4	0
	1.6	3.2	1.2	2.8	1.5	0	1.8	1.6	0
TOTAL WHO WERE A VICTIM	85	24	55	10	73	8	64	85	0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0
TYPE OF CRIME									
PERSONAL ATTACK OR THREAT WITHOUT PROPERTY LOSS	8	5	4	1	7	1	6	8	0
	9.8	19.1	6.8	11.1	9.8	13.8	9.4	9.8	0
PERSONAL ATTACK OR THREAT WITH PROPERTY LOSS	7	1	5	2	5	0	5	7	0
	8.4	4.8	9.1	20.8	6.8	0	7.8	8.4	0
PROPERTY LOSS OR DAMAGE WITHOUT ATTACK OR THREAT	63	16	42	6	55	6	48	63	0
	74.1	68.0	75.6	58.4	75.7	74.9	75.5	74.1	0
DON'T KNOW/NOT STATED	7	2	5	1	6	1	5	7	0
	7.8	8.1	8.5	9.8	7.7	11.3	7.3	7.8	0

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		[illegible] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099	441	1550	210	1873	154	1667	268	1827
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
SEX									
MALE	1048	264	727	136	904	90	792	148	896
	49.9	59.8	47.0	64.8	48.2	57.9	47.5	55.5	49.0
FEMALE	1052	178	821	74	971	65	875	119	932
	50.1	40.2	53.1	35.2	51.8	42.1	52.5	44.5	51.0
POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD									
MALE HEAD	839	203	593	107	725	70	636	116	721
	40.0	46.0	38.3	51.2	38.7	44.8	38.1	43.3	39.5
FEMALE HEAD	893	147	701	61	826	57	745	103	790
	42.6	33.3	45.3	29.3	44.0	36.6	44.7	38.7	43.2
OTHER MALE	200	58	130	27	172	20	149	30	169
	9.5	13.1	8.4	13.1	9.2	13.1	8.9	11.3	9.2
OTHER FEMALE	151	30	115	11	139	8	125	14	136
	7.2	6.7	7.4	5.3	7.4	5.5	7.5	5.3	7.4
NOT STATED	15	4	10	2	13	0	13	3	12
	.7	.9	.6	1.0	.7	0	.8	1.3	.6
MARITAL STATUS									
SINGLE	435	94	321	41	390	30	352	65	368
	20.7	21.2	20.8	19.6	20.8	19.3	21.1	24.2	20.1
MARRIED	1422	300	1053	155	1257	103	1120	178	1242
	67.8	67.7	68.0	73.9	67.1	66.5	67.2	66.7	68.0
WIDOWED/DIVORCED/SEPARATED	239	49	170	14	224	22	192	24	215
	11.4	11.1	11.0	6.5	11.9	14.1	11.5	9.1	11.7
NOT STATED	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3
	.2	0	.2	0	.2	0	.2	0	.2

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	~~NEED~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	~~NEED~~ FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
MOTHER TONGUE									
ENGLISH	1270	255	962	112	1149	112	1010	151	1118
	60.5	57.6	62.1	53.3	61.3	72.3	60.6	56.7	61.2
FRENCH	595	116	441	70	520	21	485	86	507
	28.4	26.3	28.5	33.7	27.7	13.6	29.1	32.2	27.7
OTHER	232	71	144	27	204	22	170	30	201
	11.0	16.1	9.3	13.0	10.9	14.1	10.2	11.1	11.0
NOT STATED	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
	.1	0	.1	0	.1	0	.1	0	.1
RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE									
PROTESTANT	859	173	652	73	781	78	688	85	773
	40.9	39.1	42.1	35.1	41.7	50.1	41.3	31.8	42.3
JEWISH	17	4	12	2	14	2	11	2	15
	.8	1.0	.8	1.0	.8	1.2	.7	.8	.8
ROMAN CATHOLIC	925	197	665	107	810	50	734	133	788
	44.0	44.4	42.9	51.1	43.2	32.2	44.0	49.8	43.1
OTHER	55	15	38	5	50	8	38	7	48
	2.6	3.3	2.4	2.2	2.7	5.3	2.3	2.6	2.6
NO RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE NOT STATED	243	54	182	22	219	17	196	40	203
	11.6	12.3	11.7	10.6	11.7	11.2	11.7	15.0	11.1

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
EDUCATION									
PUBLIC/GRADE SCHOOL--	383	111	244	43	339	36	289	41	341
	18.2	25.2	15.8	20.4	18.1	23.3	17.3	15.4	18.7
SOME	171	49	110	14	157	21	129	17	155
	8.2	11.2	7.1	6.9	8.4	13.3	7.8	6.3	8.5
GRADUATED	211	62	134	28	182	15	160	24	187
	10.1	14.0	8.7	13.5	9.7	10.0	9.6	9.1	10.2
SECONDARY SCHOOL--	1022	224	738	109	904	72	805	113	907
	48.7	50.7	47.7	52.3	48.2	46.1	48.3	42.4	49.6
SOME	429	111	294	52	374	29	332	42	386
	20.5	25.0	19.0	24.7	20.0	18.8	19.9	15.8	21.1
GRADUATED	593	113	445	58	530	42	474	71	521
	28.2	25.6	28.7	27.6	28.3	27.3	28.4	26.7	28.5
UNIVERSITY--	375	54	308	27	345	23	317	60	315
	17.9	12.1	19.9	12.9	18.4	14.6	19.0	22.5	17.2
SOME	119	15	101	3	115	6	107	20	98
	5.6	3.4	6.5	1.5	6.2	3.8	6.4	7.6	5.4
GRADUATED	257	39	207	24	230	17	210	40	217
	12.2	8.7	13.4	11.4	12.3	10.8	12.6	14.9	11.9
POST-SECONDARY/ NON-UNIVERSITY	315	52	255	29	285	25	255	52	261
	15.0	11.8	16.5	13.9	15.2	16.0	15.3	19.6	14.3
SOME	113	18	94	10	102	9	92	18	96
	5.4	4.1	6.0	4.9	5.5	5.6	5.5	6.6	5.2
GRADUATED	202	34	162	19	183	16	163	35	165
	9.6	7.7	10.5	9.0	9.7	10.4	9.8	12.9	9.0
NO FORMAL SCHOOLING	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	2
	.1	.2	.1	.4	*	0	.1	0	.1
REFUSED/NOT STATED	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
	.1	0	.1	0	0	0	0	0	.1

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	OWNED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	OWNED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
RESPONDENT'S OCCUPATION									
PROFESSIONAL	197	30	165	19	177	13	160	29	169
	9.4	6.8	10.6	9.0	9.4	8.5	9.6	10.8	9.2
BUSINESS EXECUTIVE/OWNER /MANAGER	174	40	130	23	151	15	131	28	146
	8.3	9.0	8.4	10.9	8.0	9.9	7.9	10.5	8.0
SALES	72	22	48	9	63	8	54	20	52
	3.4	5.0	3.1	4.1	3.3	4.9	3.2	7.4	2.9
CLERICAL	156	20	129	10	145	11	134	15	140
	7.4	4.5	8.3	4.6	7.7	7.0	8.0	5.8	7.6
SKILLED LABOUR	264	69	181	42	220	21	193	39	223
	12.6	15.5	11.7	20.2	11.7	13.3	11.6	14.8	12.2
UNSKILLED LABOUR	190	48	130	20	170	18	146	27	163
	9.0	10.7	8.4	9.6	9.0	11.7	8.8	10.1	8.9
UNEMPLOYED	98	31	62	13	85	16	68	10	88
	4.6	7.0	4.0	6.1	4.5	10.1	4.1	3.6	4.8
HOUSEWIFE	558	86	437	37	518	25	468	59	499
	26.6	19.4	28.2	17.9	27.6	16.1	28.1	22.0	27.3
STUDENT	113	21	91	9	104	4	98	19	94
	5.4	4.8	5.9	4.2	5.5	2.8	5.9	7.3	5.1
OTHER/NOT IN LABOUR FORCE	225	66	141	23	202	19	177	13	212
	10.7	14.8	9.1	10.9	10.8	12.3	10.6	5.0	11.6
REFUSED/NOT STATED	51	11	34	5	42	5	37	7	43
	2.4	2.6	2.2	2.4	2.2	3.4	2.2	2.7	2.4

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF FAMILY									
PROFESSIONAL	243	31	206	20	220	15	202	33	209
	11.6	7.0	13.3	9.6	11.8	9.5	12.1	12.5	11.4
BUSINESS EXECUTIVE/OWNER /MANAGER	335	64	259	38	295	28	261	49	286
	16.0	14.5	16.7	18.3	15.7	18.1	15.7	18.3	15.6
SALES	81	16	63	7	74	7	65	10	70
	3.8	3.7	4.1	3.3	3.9	4.7	3.9	3.6	3.8
CLERICAL	113	21	88	6	105	8	94	19	94
	5.4	4.7	5.7	3.0	5.6	5.3	5.6	7.2	5.1
SKILLED LABOUR	532	127	384	71	457	36	410	69	460
	25.4	28.6	24.8	33.7	24.4	23.2	24.6	26.0	25.2
UNSKILLED LABOUR	183	42	122	17	166	19	140	33	150
	8.7	9.5	7.9	8.0	8.9	12.4	8.4	12.4	8.2
UNEMPLOYED	92	29	58	11	81	9	71	11	81
	4.4	6.4	3.8	5.0	4.3	5.9	4.3	4.0	4.4
HOUSEWIFE	92	16	67	6	85	5	73	5	86
	4.4	3.7	4.3	3.0	4.6	3.2	4.4	2.0	4.7
STUDENT	30	2	28	0	29	1	28	11	19
	1.4	.5	1.8	0	1.5	.6	1.7	4.0	1.0
OTHER/NOT IN LABOUR FORCE	318	79	212	27	291	24	258	20	298
	15.2	17.7	13.7	13.0	15.5	15.7	15.5	7.6	16.3
REFUSED/NOT STATED	80	16	61	6	70	2	66	6	74
	3.8	3.6	3.9	2.9	3.7	1.4	3.9	2.3	4.1

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

ABSOLUTES/COL %

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD									
ONE	189	38	141	8	180	17	156	20	170
	9.0	8.5	9.1	3.9	9.6	11.1	9.4	7.3	9.3
TWO	609	130	446	52	553	47	494	70	538
	29.0	29.3	28.8	24.8	29.5	29.9	29.6	26.2	29.4
THREE	436	102	307	52	382	31	339	55	380
	20.8	23.1	19.8	24.7	20.4	19.8	20.3	20.6	20.8
FOUR	488	95	373	56	429	38	378	68	419
	23.3	21.4	24.1	26.9	22.9	24.4	22.7	25.3	22.9
FIVE	224	42	174	23	199	13	179	37	187
	10.7	9.5	11.2	10.9	10.6	8.4	10.8	13.8	10.3
SIX OR MORE	151	36	107	18	132	10	120	18	133
	7.2	8.2	6.9	8.8	7.0	6.4	7.2	6.8	7.3
NOT STATED	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	*	0	.1	0	*	0	*	0	*

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

ABSOLUTES/COL %

17 MAY 82

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		USED FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NUMBER UNDER 10 YEARS									
NONE	1431	304	1046	143	1279	99	1139	184	1244
	68.2	68.6	67.6	68.6	68.2	63.8	68.3	68.8	68.1
ONE	308	65	225	32	273	22	249	36	272
	14.7	14.7	14.6	15.3	14.6	13.9	14.9	13.5	14.9
TWO	242	52	182	21	219	31	180	33	208
	11.6	11.7	11.7	9.9	11.7	19.6	10.8	12.4	11.4
THREE	67	11	54	7	58	2	55	13	54
	3.2	2.6	3.5	3.4	3.1	1.4	3.3	4.9	2.9
FOUR OR MORE	18	4	14	3	15	0	15	0	18
	.9	.9	.9	1.3	.8	0	.9	0	1.0
NOT STATED	33	6	27	3	30	2	28	1	32
	1.6	1.4	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.3	1.7	.4	1.7
NUMBER BETWEEN 10 AND 17 YEARS									
NONE	1531	328	1124	144	1376	118	1222	188	1338
	72.9	74.2	72.6	69.0	73.4	76.0	73.3	70.6	73.2
ONE	309	54	234	25	281	23	246	49	260
	14.7	12.2	15.1	11.8	15.0	14.9	14.7	18.2	14.2
TWO	164	35	122	26	136	9	125	20	143
	7.8	7.9	7.9	12.6	7.3	6.1	7.5	7.6	7.8
THREE	49	16	32	10	39	3	35	7	41
	2.3	3.6	2.0	4.6	2.1	1.8	2.1	2.7	2.3
FOUR OR MORE	18	1	15	1	16	0	15	2	17
	.9	.2	1.0	.5	.9	0	.9	.6	.9
NOT STATED	29	8	21	3	26	2	24	1	28
	1.4	1.9	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.4	.3	1.5

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099 100.0	443 100.0	1548 100.0	209 100.0	1875 100.0	155 100.0	1667 100.0	267 100.0	1828 100.0
TRADE UNION MEMBERSHIP									
YES, SELF	308 14.7	71 15.9	220 14.2	39 18.6	265 14.1	18 11.5	243 14.6	42 15.9	263 14.4
YES, SPOUSE	214 10.2	48 10.8	154 10.0	19 9.1	192 10.3	15 9.6	172 10.3	35 13.3	179 9.8
BOTH	40 1.9	9 2.1	31 2.0	4 1.9	36 1.9	5 3.2	31 1.9	4 1.4	35 1.9
NO	1502 71.6	310 70.0	1115 72.0	147 70.4	1348 71.9	116 74.6	1190 71.4	182 68.3	1320 72.2
NOT STATED	35 1.7	5 1.1	28 1.8	0 0	34 1.8	2 1.0	31 1.9	3 1.1	31 1.7

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME									
UNDER $6,000	99	18	72	7	91	7	80	10	89
	4.7	4.1	4.7	3.3	4.9	4.4	4.8	3.9	4.9
$6,000 - $7,999	101	24	67	4	96	10	85	12	89
	4.8	5.4	4.3	1.8	5.1	6.7	5.1	4.4	4.9
$8,000 - $9,999	77	14	59	6	70	6	61	3	73
	3.7	3.2	3.8	2.9	3.7	4.1	3.7	1.1	4.0
$10,000 - $12,999	121	25	89	9	112	12	95	7	114
	5.8	5.7	5.7	4.3	6.0	7.6	5.7	2.8	6.2
$13,000 - $14,999	87	18	67	11	76	3	69	6	81
	4.2	4.1	4.3	5.4	4.1	2.1	4.1	2.4	4.4
$15,000 - $19,999	205	53	148	31	173	16	156	31	174
	9.8	12.0	9.6	14.8	9.2	10.2	9.4	11.4	9.5
$20,000 - $29,999	413	89	304	43	367	32	331	58	355
	19.7	20.2	19.7	20.7	19.6	20.8	19.8	21.6	19.4
$30,000 AND OVER	460	75	369	50	407	24	370	84	375
	21.9	17.0	23.8	24.0	21.7	15.6	22.2	31.4	20.5
REFUSED/NOT STATED	536	125	373	48	482	44	420	56	478
	25.5	28.2	24.1	22.8	25.7	28.6	25.2	21.0	26.1

PROFILES OF RESPONDENTS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS:		[redacted] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION:		WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS:		EVER BEEN VICTIM:	
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
AGE									
18 TO 29 YEARS	668	147	493	68	596	58	525	83	581
	31.8	33.2	31.9	32.6	31.8	37.3	31.5	31.1	31.8
30 TO 49 YEARS	727	144	550	81	637	50	570	116	610
	34.6	32.5	35.5	38.8	34.0	32.3	34.2	43.6	33.4
50 YEARS AND OVER	679	145	488	56	620	45	554	64	614
	32.3	32.7	31.5	26.6	33.1	29.0	33.2	23.8	33.6
NOT STATED	26	7	17	4	22	2	18	4	22
	1.2	1.6	1.1	1.9	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.5	1.2

DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: ---- NO	[illegible] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	[illegible] FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: ---- NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: ------ NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-ACTUAL	2099 100.0	441 100.0	1550 100.0	210 100.0	1873 100.0	154 100.0	1667 100.0	268 100.0	1827 100.0
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099 100.0	443 100.0	1548 100.0	209 100.0	1875 100.0	155 100.0	1667 100.0	267 100.0	1828 100.0
REGION									
NEWFOUNDLAND	51 2.4	9 2.0	38 2.5	3 1.2	48 2.6	4 2.6	43 2.6	0 0	51 2.8
P.E.I.	11 .5	1 .3	8 .5	0 0	11 .6	4 2.7	6 .4	2 .8	9 .5
NOVA SCOTIA	79 3.8	26 5.9	48 3.1	6 3.1	72 3.9	16 10.1	53 3.2	8 2.8	72 3.9
NEW BRUNSWICK	62 2.9	16 3.7	40 2.6	9 4.3	51 2.7	7 4.2	41 2.5	3 1.1	59 3.2
QUEBEC	574 27.3	118 26.8	420 27.2	68 32.7	501 26.7	21 13.8	466 28.0	79 29.7	493 27.0
ONTARIO	750 35.8	139 31.5	580 37.4	73 34.8	677 36.1	45 29.2	615 36.9	99 36.9	650 35.5
MANITOBA	88 4.2	21 4.7	65 4.2	9 4.1	80 4.3	3 2.0	77 4.6	5 1.9	83 4.6
SASKATCHEWAN	91 4.3	24 5.3	59 3.8	7 3.1	84 4.5	9 6.0	70 4.2	6 2.3	84 4.6
ALBERTA	163 7.8	45 10.2	115 7.4	18 8.8	141 7.5	23 14.9	112 6.7	35 13.3	128 7.0
BRITISH COLUMBIA	231 11.0	43 9.7	174 11.3	17 8.0	211 11.3	22 14.4	184 11.0	30 11.2	201 11.0

DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWS
BASE TOTAL RESPONDENTS 18 YEARS AND OVER

	TOTAL	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: YES	SHOULD KEEP FIREARMS: NO	FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: YES	FIREARMS FOR PROTECTION: NO	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: YES	WOULD ACQUIRE FIREARMS: NO	EVER BEEN VICTIM: YES	EVER BEEN VICTIM: NO
BASE FOR PERCENTAGES-WEIGHTED	2099	443	1548	209	1875	155	1667	267	1828
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
COMMUNITY SIZE									
OVER 500,000	789	130	627	49	733	43	668	132	654
	37.6	29.5	40.5	23.5	39.1	27.6	40.0	49.5	35.8
100,000 - 500,000	304	59	228	25	276	19	249	43	262
	14.5	13.2	14.7	12.0	14.7	12.5	14.9	15.9	14.3
30,000 - 100,000	163	28	129	9	153	11	135	18	144
	7.8	6.2	8.3	4.5	8.1	7.4	8.1	6.7	7.9
10,000 - 30,000	147	33	108	18	128	12	115	9	138
	7.0	7.5	7.0	8.5	6.9	7.6	6.9	3.3	7.6
1,000 - 10,000	199	43	143	22	176	18	154	19	180
	9.5	9.7	9.2	10.4	9.4	11.5	9.3	7.1	9.9
UNDER 1,000 (RURAL NON-FARM/FARM)	496	150	314	86	408	52	347	46	450
	23.6	33.8	20.3	41.1	21.7	33.4	20.8	17.4	24.6
LANGUAGE									
ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE	1553	330	1148	143	1400	138	1222	189	1362
	74.0	74.7	74.2	68.1	74.7	89.0	73.3	70.8	74.5
FRENCH QUESTIONNAIRE	546	112	400	67	475	17	445	78	466
	26.0	25.3	25.8	31.9	25.3	11.0	26.7	29.2	25.5